



Anti-SLAPP law should be stayed pending discovery required by Rule 56. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference as if fully stated herein, Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Proceedings Regarding Defendants' Motion to Strike or Dismiss Pursuant to California's Anti-SLAPP Law Pending Discovery.

### **Points and Authorities**

Courts have "broad discretion" to stay proceedings. *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997). "[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Landis v. North Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. The Plaintiffs believe that the above-referenced stay will help secure the just and efficient resolution of this proceeding.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs request that the Court grant their Motion to Stay.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs move the Court to approve the above-proposed Motion to Stay.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**THE BURNS LAW FIRM, LLC**

/s/ John C. Burns  
John C. Burns #66462MO  
1717 Park Avenue  
St. Louis, MO 63104  
Phone: (314) 339-8388  
Fax: (314) 932-2171  
john@burns-law-firm.com  
*Attorney for Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served, via the Court's electronic notification system, on December 18, 2015, upon all parties of record.

/s/ John C. Burns